

# Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME III.]

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1858.

[NUMBER 9.]

## The Radical Abolitionist

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

### Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do. ....	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do. ....	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do. ....	10.00

Payments in advance.

### THE GREAT CONSPIRACY—FEDERAL ESTABLISHMENT OF SLAVERY IN ALL THE STATES—PREDICTIONS VERIFIED.

The readers of our paper, and of our 'American Jubilee,' that preceded it, are aware that from the early part of the struggle for passing the Kansas Nebraska Bill, we have insisted that the slave power is intent upon the establishment of slavery in all the States, by the Federal authority.

We have, until quite recently, stood almost alone, in expressing this conviction. We find, however, that the Hon. ISRAEL WASHBURN, Member of Congress from Maine, has held the same language all along, as will appear from the following extracts from his speeches.

In Mr. Washburn's Speech on the Bill to organize Territorial Governments in Kansas and Nebraska, in the House of Representatives, April 7, 1854, having quoted the Charleston Mercury, and Mr. Stephens of Georgia, as denying the constitutional right of the Territories to exclude slavery, Mr. W. said—

"Well, sir, as I have said, the drama of non-intervention, after one performance more, will be removed from the stage forever. As we sometimes read on the bills, it is 'positively for one night only.' Whether it shall accomplish the abrogation of the Missouri compromise or not, it will have filled its destiny. In the former case, it will be thrown overboard by the South as a thing for which they never had any respect, and now have no further use. Then we shall hear that the time has come for the inculcation of the true doctrine: 'The North is sufficiently weakened and humbled—the country is ready for it—let it be proclaimed everywhere, that the Constitution of the United States, *proprio vigore*, carries slavery wherever the flag of the Union flies.' It carries it, we are told, into the Territories, and neither Congress nor the local Legislatures, nor both combined, can restrain its march, for the Constitution is above both, is the supreme law of the land. Ay, and carries it into all the States, for neither State laws nor State constitutions can exclude the enjoyment of a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the Federal Government. This, sir, is the doctrine with which we shall be vigorously pressed if this bill is carried. Already has it been more than hinted, and whoever has noticed the advanced ground which slavery occupies now, compared with that on which it rested in 1850, will not be slow to believe it.

"I will here ask your attention to the fact, which I meant to have noticed before, that Senator Hunter, of Virginia, the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. Clingman,) and nearly all southern gentlemen who have spoken on this subject, and have in any manner recognized the doctrine of non-intervention, are careful to limit the right of the people of the Territories to legislate for themselves, by the Constitution of the United States; and that they hold that the Constitution forbids all territorial legislation for the prohibition of slavery.

"And in this connection let me remark, what you must have observed, that in the debate which took place

in the Senate a few days ago on the Badger amendment, it was distinctly stated by southern Senators, that in the event of future acquisitions of territory, no implication was to be drawn from this bill that the people of such Territory should be allowed to decide for themselves the question of the admission of slavery.

"In view of these facts, northern gentlemen will perceive how transcendently important it is for them to make, while they are yet able, a successful stand against the aggressions of the slave power."

Again, in his speech in the Committee of the whole, on the state of the Union, June 21, 1856, Mr. Washburn, after having narrated and described the reign of the border ruffians in Kansas, said—

"Thus has ended the shameful lesson of *popular sovereignty*. And now, sir, its fallacies and cheats are acknowledged and vaunted everywhere; and the unmitigated southern doctrine, that the Constitution of the United States carries and protects slavery in all the Territories, is adopted in substance at Cincinnati as the foundation stone of democracy. One step more remains to be taken, and that follows logically from the last—it is, that under the Constitution of the United States, slavery may exist in, and cannot by any power be excluded from, the several States."

Yet again, in his speech in the House on the President's Message and the slavery question, Dec. 10, 1857, in contending against the doctrine of the Message that the Constitution carries slavery into the Territories, Mr. Washburn said—

"Mr. Speaker, I object to this new-fangled and unconstitutional doctrine, not only for what it is, but for what it prophecies and prepares the way for. Acquiesce in it, yield to it as founded in a just construction of the Constitution, and there is but one step more—and that not a long one—to be taken, to make the subjugation of the free States as complete as could be desired. Do you think gentlemen who propose to call the roll of their slaves on Bunker Hill will be long in discovering, after this, that it is not competent for a State to make laws in derogation of the Federal Constitution, and in violation, as it will be said, of the equal rights of the citizens of other States?"

And finally, in his speech in the House, Jan. 7, 1858, on the Kansas and Lecompton Constitution, having adverted to the Dred Scott decision, and to the President's Silliman letter, Mr. Washburn said—

"If this be sound doctrine, it is plain that the Constitution carries slavery, not only into the Territories, but into the States; for whenever it makes property, no State law or Constitution can declare it shall not be property.

"Sir, this is a monstrous doctrine; and that it is necessary to be maintained, only proves the mischievous and desperate character of the system for whose protection it is invoked. Is it the true doctrine, then was the Constitution ordained not to secure the 'blessings of liberty' to the people of this country, but to fix upon them forever a system regarded, we have been taught to believe, by its framers, and all the early statesmen, as without foundation in natural right or sound policy; then must it be admitted that the great end and object of the Constitution was to establish or protect slavery every where within the range of its operations. For if it recognizes, and was intended to recognize, property in slaves to such an extent that it is not within the power of a State, (or Territory,) by its laws, to forbid the existence of this relation within its own jurisdiction, it does, in regard to property in slaves, what it has never been understood to effect in respect to property in any thing else—it makes a fundamental distinction between slave property and all other kinds of property."

Such has been the testimony of Mr. Washburn. We believe that, until lately, he has not been able to obtain, among his associates, a recognition of the startling fact.

Since the vote in the Senate, to admit Kansas, Mr. Washburn has said—

"But now, by the Kansas Constitution, which declares that the right of an owner to his slave, as property, is before and above any constitutional sanction, and which thirty three Senators affirmed, by their votes, yesterday, the doctrine is set up and maintained, that slavery exists, not only where the Federal Constitution operates, but that, by the laws of nature—a law above all constitutions—it exists, or may exist, everywhere beneath the sun. In other words, that a republican government is a false and unnatural one; and that a government founded on classes—a privileged class and a degraded class—is true and legitimate. The doctrine of to-day is, that a republican government is a falsehood, a humbug; and an aristocracy the only government consistent with the Divine law."

Mr. Washburn is correct. The slaveholders and the administration will not deny—nay, they will soon claim (if the House concurs with the Senate,) that the effect of the vote in respect to the universal legality of slavery by natural law, was precisely as Mr. W. has described. All the rest is involved of course, as Mr. De Bow evidently understands. Is it not time to enforce the constitutional guarantee, to every State in this Union, of a republican form of government?

As to the designs of the pro-slavery administration, a recent speech of Mr. FESSENDEN, of Maine, intimates a suspicion, at least, of the same thing.

Further testimony may be found in the following extract from a recent

### SPEECH OF MR. BLAIR, OF MISSOURI.

"It is not Kansas alone," continued Mr. Blair, "that is embraced in this conspiracy, but the whole continent upon which we live. hateful as is the policy by which it has been sought to force upon Kansas an institution abhorred by its people—hateful as are the low and mean frauds by which this policy has been pushed—hateful as are the crimes by which, for three years, that Territory has been held in subjection—still more hateful and abhorred is the avowed purpose of the President to apply that policy to the whole country—a purpose distinctly avowed in his Lecompton Message, as well as in his letter to certain gentlemen in Connecticut. His declaration that the Constitution of the United States carries slavery into all the Territories of the Union, and that neither Congress nor the people of the Territories can prohibit its introduction, was first promulgated by the late Mr. Calhoun, and, as the President says, the doctrine has finally been decided by the highest judicial tribunal of the country. The sovereignty of Congress over its Territories, and the sovereignty of the people of the Territories, are alike designed to be struck down by the Supreme Court, and the President accepts its decision. This decision of the Supreme Court is a Lecompton Constitution for the whole country. For, if Congress has no right to prohibit slavery in the Territories, and the people of the Territories have not the right, whence comes the right of the people to prohibit it when forming a State constitution? They cannot derive the right from Congress, because the Supreme Court denies the power in Congress, nor can they derive it from the people of the Territory who do not themselves possess it. The organ of the administration, the Washington Union, has boldly put forth this doctrine, that a State cannot abolish slavery, deriving it logically and legitimately from the decision of the Supreme Court, and it has been rewarded for its boldness by the election of its editor to be printer of the United States Senate.

"Mr. Blair could not see how any man who holds to the doctrine of the Supreme Court, that neither Congress nor the people of a Territory can prohibit a slaveholder from carrying his property into any Territory acquired by the confederacy of sovereign States at their joint expense, can deny the right of the slaveholder to carry his property into any State formed of territory thus acquired. In fact the case is stronger against the State than against the Territory, for the Constitution of the United States, which is said to recognize the right of property in slaves, is the supreme law of all the States, but does not, by its terms, apply to the Territories, and it was held by Mr. Webster and the most eminent constitutional lawyers in the country, not to extend to them at all.



"What," exclaimed Mr. Blair, "have the advocates of popular sovereignty to say to this decision of the Supreme Court, which subverts the power of the people of a Territory, the power of the people of a State, the power of the people of the Union, to prohibit slavery?—which invests the slaveholder with absolute sovereignty, empowering him to walk into a State, and carry with him his slaves, and by his single will establish slavery there, until the next day, or next week, or next year, he sees fit to walk out again, and graciously leaves the people to resume their free institutions until another sovereign slaveholder comes along, pitches his tent among them, and re-establishes the patriarchal institution?"

"In saying this," said Mr. Blair, "I do not speak for the freemen of the North alone, but for the freemen of the whole country. This is no question of North against South. It is a question which addresses itself to the working men of all sections of the country, and if it is of particular interest to any class of men, it is so to the free white laborers of the South, for it is they who have received the greatest injury from the pressure of slavery—which has almost literally excluded them from ownership in the soil, and from all the employments which elsewhere afford to the laboring man the means of living in independence and comfort."

#### THE RELIGIOUS REVIVALS—HARRIET BEECHER STOWE'S OPINION.

[From the Independent, March 11.]

The great turning of the public mind to religion forms so marked an event in our present times, that even secular papers are noticing it. For the most part, too, their notices are not scoffing or disrespectful, but tentative, serious, and suggestive. They seem to say, "There is need enough among us of a revival of religion, heaven knows—pray God only that it be real, and of the right kind."

They say, we hope it will do some good to men in a political and business capacity—that it will make them honest, and true, and upright, and magnanimous. "No revival has ever done anything for Wall street yet," says one; "we hope *this* may." "We hope," says another, "that prayer for the slave may not be considered an intrusion in these frequent prayer-meetings, and that some penitence may be felt and expressed for the share which northern churches have had in aiding and abetting a system of robbery and oppression." So speaks the outside World, as she looks gravely, sadly, not scoffingly, on the spectacle of thronging churches and opening prayer meetings—and her demand is just.

There is something in a right name. The term "revival" seems by general consent to have been adopted into our language as expressive of these seasons; but we should much prefer a term formerly much employed among certain religious denominations—"reformation." Instead of the *great revival* of 1858, we should be happy to read the *great reformation* of 1858.

Many worldly people, and some very Christian people, have a prejudice against any thing like periodicity in religious impulse. They dislike revivals. Why should the Divine One, who is always love, say they, be considered as operating impulsively and periodically on the human soul, sometimes shining and sometimes withdrawing? It is urged, furthermore, that the expectation of such seasons becomes in the end a motive for sloth and inaction, and a neglect of an even and constant culture of the religious nature.

All this may have some truth in it; but, nevertheless, it is a fact that religious impulses, like all other impulses, have always come over the world in waves. To begin with the day of Pentecost, in which three thousand were converted in one day, we find all along the line of the history of the church, that there were seasons when religious impulses were more than usually fervent, and religious labors successful.

There were revivals under the preaching of Augustine and Chrysostom; and the great force of the Reformation was not merely political or intellectual, but it was the deep upheaving of the religious element, bringing all other reforms in its train. The *Reformation was a revival of religion*. The revivals in England under the Wesleys and Whitfield inaugurated a new era there, which is felt to-day, in the power of the dissenting element, and the improved state of things in the Established Church. The preaching of the Wesleys, the Fletchers, and of Whitfield to the colliers and cotters of England, was the first movement for the general religious instruction of the masses, and led the way to the multiplied labors of that kind with which England now abounds. It is a noticeable fact, in all these cases, that they were followed by political and moral reforms; the work proved itself divine by its beneficent results. This is a fair test. "He that is of God doeth the works of God;" and by this test should every so-called revival be judged. Revivals, which make men better, and bless society, have been and may be realities. But the rule is without exception, that every truly valuable thing has its

counterfeit. When we read of great revivals, where the Christian converts claim as a sacred right the privilege of selling the members of Christ for money; where they defend the breaking of the marriage covenant at the will of the master, and take away from the colored member the right of testimony, and are so lost to all moral sense as to see no harm in any of these things, we hold that that revival has been spurious and counterfeit. So also as to northern churches, which, for reasons of expediency, and to carry ends of ecclesiastical politics, have refused to testify against these sins, we hold that a revival of religion that brings no repentance and reformation is false and spurious.

We believe in no raptures, in no ecstasies, in no experiences that do not bring the soul into communion with Him who declared He came to set at liberty them that are bound and bruised. Revivals of religion have not been confined to Christian countries. Old heathenism had them. Popish Rome has them. Modern heathenism has them. One and all of these have had turns of unusual fervor in their way. One and all have had their trances, illuminations, and mysterious ecstasies. But those only are Christian revivals which make men like Christ; or, if they do not make them like Him, at least set them on the road of trying to be like Him. We say, therefore, to our friends, that the period of a great religious impulse has come; that there will be revivals all over the land, either false or true—either of a Christian or a heathen type; and by their fruits shall ye know them. We are glad to hear that some of the most effective revival preachers confine their attention very much to preaching to the church. We are glad to hear that. It is quite necessary that those who profess to be the exponents of religion before the community, should have some deeper and higher ideas of what religion is. So that when they go forth with the Apostolic message, "Repent and be converted every one of you," they need not be met with the scornful reply, "Converted, sir, converted to what? Converted into a man who defends slavery—converted into one who dares not testify against a profitable wickedness—converted into a man whose religion never goes into his counting house—converted into a man who has no conscience in his politics, and who scoffs at the higher-law of God? No, sir; I desire no such conversion. Whatever your raptures may be, I desire no part with them."

And let the solemn question go out to every Christian, to every parent, "Do you want your neighbors, friends and children converted into such Christians as you have been?" If not, is there not a deeper conversion necessary for you? H. B. S.

#### AGITATION IN MISSOURI—DENIAL OF LEGALITY OF SLAVERY—OPINION OF JUDGE MARSHALL, &c.

A speech was delivered some time ago, in the hall of the House of Representatives, Jefferson city, Missouri, by James B. Gardenhire, President of the Jefferson City Land Company, which contains some declarations quite remarkable, as coming from that quarter. We must notice a few of them.

1.—*Fugitive Slave Bill at the South*.—Mr. Gardenhire denies the obligation to return fugitive slaves, as required in the fugitive slave bill. He says:

"It is an anomaly. There is no such obligation between the citizens of the slave States. We cannot here be made to help catch runaway slaves, and any attempt to pass a law making it our duty to do so, would meet the most decided opposition. A law making it our duty to quit our own affairs, and help our neighbors catch their stray horses, would not be tolerated."

2.—*No Law for Slavery*.—Mr. G. adds—

"That it is the constitutional right of slave-owners to follow their runaway slaves into free territory, and recapture them, is beyond question; but as slavery exists by force, and not by law, they ought to be left to their own exertions, aided alone by those who are willing to do so."

There seems here a little confusion and incongruity. If "slavery exists by force and not by law," then catching runaway slaves is kidnapping, a high crime, to be tolerated nowhere, by any body.

3.—*Slavery Illegal according to Judge Marshall*.—

The civil law defines Slavery thus: "Slavery is an institution by the laws of nations, by which one man is subjected to another man, as master, contrary to nature." And Chief Justice Marshall, expounding this, says "That Slavery is contrary to the laws of nature, will scarcely be denied; that every man has a right to the fruits of his own labor is generally admitted; and that no person can rightfully deprive him of these fruits, and appropriate them to his will, seems the necessary result of that admission."

4.—*The Dred Scott Decision vs. State Law against Slavery*.—Mr. G. says:

"If that decision is right, it is difficult to see how slavery can be kept out of any Territory or any State ever formed since the adoption of the Constitution. If Congress has no power and the people of the Territories none, whence does it come? Not from a Territorial Convention. It represents a Territory, not a State. In constitutional parlance, it cannot be such until admitted into the Union. All Territories must then be admitted as slave States, and made otherwise, if at all, afterward, and where the power to do it afterward comes from is a puzzle. The people did not have it to keep, and Congress did not have it to give, and yet in a sovereign State it exists. What particular process creates it I have never been able to settle."

This describes correctly the doctrine of President Buchanan's Message. Mr. G. contends ably against the doctrine, but we fail to see why it does not apply to the original States as well as the new. Virginia is evidently intent on applying it to New York, in the case of Mr. Leamon's slaves.

Mr. Gardenhire confronts the pro-slavery arguments, that "our Savior did not condemn slavery"—that "our slaves are better off than the white laborers of the North"—"that we enslave our children and apprentices under twenty-one years old." "All these arguments," says Mr. G., "prove too much, and enslave the white man as well as the negro."

5.—*Absurdity of trying to legalize Slavery*.—Says Mr. G.:

"The right to enslave one race includes the right to enslave all races, and the right to enslave all races includes the right to enslave any individual of any race. This rule would set us to catching and enslaving one another, and force alone, as between the Portuguese and African, could determine who should be the master and who the slave, reducing Slavery to its known original argument—brute force."

We are glad to see a Missourian, on Missouri soil, taking such strong ground, though we notice some incongruities and mistakes which we trust, Mr. G. will learn to correct in due time. As a whole, the speech was a noble one. He introduced at length, from Franklin's works, the speech of Sid Mehemit Ibrahim, the Divan of Algiers, in favor of enslaving Christians, as a fair offset to Christian defenses of enslaving Africans. He adverted to the bombardment of Algiers by Com. Decatur, of the United States Navy, in resistance to the enslavement of Americans and Europeans, in which he convinced them (the Algerines,) that slavery was a debatable question, and that he was in favor of agitation. He vindicated the right of Northern emigrants to settle in slave States, "for the purpose of changing our institutions," and made no secret of his desires for the accomplishment of that object in Missouri, remarking that—"it is not pretended that Congress, the representatives of all the States, can prevent our abolishing slavery if we choose."

Exceptions to this latter statement should be made in view of the position of Virginia, Judge Taney, and President Buchanan, as noticed



Mr. G., unless a distinction, of little importance, be made between Congress and the Supreme Court.

# RADICAL ABOLITION IN KENTUCKY.

We copy the following editorial from the *Kentucky Weekly News*, by Wm. S. Bailey:

## SLAVERY EVERYWHERE AND FREEDOM NOWHERE.

We publish to-day an article from the *Washington Union*, declaring that the Constitution of the United States upholds slavery, both in the free and the slave States, and that the Constitutions and laws of the free States, so far as they prohibit slaveholding, are unconstitutional. It should be remembered that this declaration proceeds from the official organ of the present administration, and is the opinion of the United States Court, and as such it should command the general attention of all men, no matter to what parties they may belong.

Freedom and slavery cannot co-exist under the same Government, and the people will shortly be compelled to choose between free labor and free discussion, or slave labor without discussion. The times are passing by when men can sustain an anti-slavery reputation, and oppose slavery merely in Kansas or Utah. The question is, "shall freedom be proclaimed throughout all the land and all the inhabitants thereof?" or "shall the slave oligarchy rule the entire nation both in the free and the slave States?"

When freedom is thus assailed by the Government and the Supreme Court, and all their powers are strained for the nationalization of slavery, the anti-slavery men must fight with renewed zeal in the great cause. Nothing less than the entire overthrow of slavery should be their aim. We must "carry the war into Africa." We must establish freedom of discussion in the slave States, and thus open the eyes of the people of all sections of the Union to the injuries which slavery inflicts upon them. We must show to the laboring men of the slave States that their own rights and prosperity are endangered by the sway of the slave power.

While the slave oligarchy is making these gigantic efforts to spread their system abroad, the establishment and maintenance of free presses in the slave States will revolutionize public sentiment there, and prostrate all these attempts to ostracize free labor. Slavery must be exterminated, and the battle must be fought here upon slave soil, where the gigantic crime against humanity stalks forth at noonday, and basks in the sunshine of popular opinion.

A few pioneer presses have already passed the frontier, just as the pioneers of old passed the Alleghany mountains and converted the wilderness to the uses of civilization. The people of the slave States must be Christianized and enlightened upon this subject, and with proper aid the work can be accomplished in less time than it took to civilize the Ohio valley. It is not slavery in *Kansas* which is dangerous to the Union, but slavery in the States—in Missouri and Kentucky. Let the border slave States become true to freedom, and the truth will spread southward till it reaches the gulf of Mexico. Unaided as we have been, we have already established freedom of discussion upon slave soil, and had the attention of the anti-slavery men been properly directed to this field of missionary labor, the slave oligarchy would have been compelled long since to act upon the defensive, instead of spreading slavery by means of false construction, through the Constitution, into every part of the Union. Let our friends adopt the maxim of "Freedom Everywhere, and Slavery Nowhere," as their rallying cry, and victory must crown their efforts, for truth is mighty and must prevail.

### From the same:

**SLAVES LIBERATED.**—The will of Mrs. Lucy Pine, of Louisville, who liberated all her slaves, nine in number, was registered on Monday. She gave to each of them one hundred dollars in cash and made them equal heirs to her real estate in Jefferson street, at the death of an aged brother. The slaves are to be sent to Ohio.

If slaves are merely chattel property, what charity or philanthropy was there in setting these nine chattels free? If they are human beings, and nature and nature's God bestow upon them the rights that they bestow upon all human beings, what poor mortal here below has the power guaranteed to him, to say whether these

beings shall enjoy their natural God-given rights, or shall not.

### FROM THE SAME.

The *Kentucky Weekly News* publishes the proceedings of a Republican State Convention, at Indianapolis, Ind., March 2d, with the resolutions adopted, among which was the following:—

*Resolved*,—That we disclaim the right to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists under the State's sovereignty, but oppose the extension of slavery into new Territory.

From this the *Kentucky* editor strongly dissents, in an article from which we extract the following:—

The perusal of the fourth resolution causes us to regret that a Republican party, which should be governed by the principles of those men whose hands were "wet with Revolutionary blood and who took their oaths that Liberty should never die," should be found guilty of endorsing a resolution that disclaims all right of interference with slavery in the States where it now exists. Is this Democratic? Is it Republican? Is it right? Is it just? Assuredly not. If we disclaim the right of interfering with slavery where it exists, we virtually acknowledge that it exists there of right, and if we admit this, then the Republican party ceases to meet the views of those who have labored through long years to arouse the people of the slave States to a true appreciation of their degraded condition. We deny that slavery exists by right in any State or Territory in the United States. It exists and is upheld by men who enrich themselves by gradually draining the very life blood from their fellow men. It is an outrage upon a Republican form of Government, and causes us to appear odious and disgusting to freemen of other countries. It deprives not only the black man of his inalienable rights, but reduces the poor white man to a condition even worse than the slave, his labor being brought in competition with that of the negro, thereby depriving him of the means wherewith to gain an honest livelihood. It is, in short, a cursed and abominable system, conceived in sin and upheld by misrepresentation and violence. Such being the case, we would respectfully ask the framers and endorsers of the fourth resolution how they could, honestly and conscientiously, give it their approval.

### COMMENTS OF I. S. UPON J. P. B.

Mr. Editor,—My series of questions, to which your correspondent J. P. B. replied in your March number, was intended as an argument. I hoped the argument would be tested by a thorough examination, but was not at all expecting a formal answer to each question. The argument was of course intended for those who regard civil government as divinely ordained for the good of the people. In my presumption of J. P. B.'s views, I erred. I now learn that he regards society as composed of two classes: those who, for bad purposes, usurp the power of government, and those who submit to it from servility and fear. Is his self-implication just? Had I not presumed him too honest to be a usurper, and too dignified to submit to government from servility and fear, I could not have addressed to him a respectful invitation to examine my questions. He complains that he cannot see the bearing of some of them. I think he has not discovered the bearing of any. How could he? The light of the body is the eye. Had he been favored with eyes to see, with the Apostle, that all ruling authority is from God, and that those who are invested with it, are his ministers for good to the people, he would have understood that where there is any authority to rule, there is authority to do it with impartial justice for the protection of all. It would follow, of course, in his mind,

that where there is not authority to rule for the protection of the most needy, there is no authority at all. In the same view J. P. B. would see that a people putting forth such a declaration as the preamble of the Constitution, ought not to be hypocritical, but to mean what they say, and take care to elect such rulers that their meaning will be carried into effect. The same declaration, adopted by confederating States, would be as binding on them as on the people.

Suppose a controlling majority of the nation should carry these views into effect. Would the great ends of government, and of the Federal Constitution, and of State sovereignty be defeated? or would they be fulfilled?

I put the question to those who do not mistake the abuses of government for its uses.

I protest against the liberty of J. P. B., in altering one of my questions—choosing to state my own questions in my own way. Your replies to him please me. With your views you can obey government from a higher motive than servility.

I. S.

**THE REMOVAL OF JUDGE LORING**, from the office of Judge of Probate, in Boston, on account of his acting as United States Commissioner in the rendition of the fugitive slave Burns, is a decided and glorious triumph for the cause of liberty in Massachusetts. Twice, previously, had the people demanded it through their State Legislature, and twice did Governor Gardner, though elected by votes of anti-slavery men and abolitionists, refuse to comply. Governor Banks has been impelled by public sentiment to yield. Honor to old Massachusetts, and honor to the unflinching abolitionists of Massachusetts, for their perseverance and resolution. Our Garrisonian friends deserve special credit for the laboring oar of this achievement, and we gladly award it to them. In this, they were on the right track, and have succeeded. May they always be as wise and as successful. They are proposing one good step more.

"The next thing," says the *Liberator*, "is to decree that no human being shall be put on trial in this State before any tribunal, to determine whether he is the property of another; that it shall be a criminal act to institute any such suit; and that every fugitive slave shall instantly be transformed into a freeman as soon as he touches the soil of Massachusetts. No Slave Commissioner must be allowed to exist among us; there must be no more slave hunts in all our borders; there must be no more fleeing to Canada to find a refuge from the pursuer; the claim of property in man, in all cases, must be resented with indignation, rejected with abhorrence, and regarded as blasphemy. And this is only saying, that Massachusetts must be true to the first article of her Bill of Rights, and see that it is thoroughly executed. It reads thus—

"Article 1. ALL MEN ARE BORN FREE AND EQUAL, and have certain natural, essential and inherent rights, among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties, acquiring, possessing and protecting property; and, in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

That's right, friend Garrison, exactly; and for your encouragement, let us remind you that the House of Assembly of New York, under the influence of radical abolitionists, particularly of Gerrit Smith, who lectured on the subject, in the State Capitol, came within seven votes of carrying a similar measure. Go ahead, abolitionists of Massachusetts, and see which State shall first be brought up to that standard. Go ahead, and remember that the same prin-



ciple requires us to demand at the hands of our National Government, the same protection for all the slaves in the nation. THE NATION, and every State embraced in it, in the exercise of its "State Sovereignty and State Rights," has enunciated a similar and an older Bill of Rights, just as binding upon the NATION and the States, as the Massachusetts Bill of Rights is upon Massachusetts. Let us rise up, then, as a Nation, (the non-slaveholding States being the majority,) and insist that "no Slave Commissioner," nor slaveholder "must be allowed" in the nation, "that there must be no more slave hunts in all our borders—no more fleeing to Canada," nor from one State to another, "to find a refuge from the pursuer." "The claim of property, in all cases, must be rejected with indignation—rejected with abhorrence, and regarded as a blasphemy." "This is only saying that" the Nation "must be true to the first article of its Bill of Rights, and see that it is thoroughly executed. It reads thus"—

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That for the security of these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

On such a platform the great body of earnest abolitionists might again be united. Heaven speed the day!

THE TRACT SOCIETY.—What is to be done by the American Tract Society, at the coming Anniversary? We hope it will do something better than to secure the republication of Bishop Meade's "Duties of Masters" &c.—a work which fully recognizes the rightfulness of the relation of owners of slave property. Rev. Dr. RAY PALMER, of Albany, "one of the investigating Committee," in a long "letter to a Massachusetts Layman," published in the New York Independent of Feb. 25, seems to think that the publication of that Tract would have been just the thing. The refusal of the Secretaries to publish it, he thinks quite unfortunate. "It was a golden opportunity of harmonizing every thing, unwisely lost." It would have satisfied the North and the South. There had been, he said, "no attempt to abolitionize the Society in any sense," or to "convert the Society into a great anti-slavery agency." It was only desired and voted that the Society should "publish, in a kind and Christian manner, on the known and universally acknowledged duties and evils connected with slavery as it is, saying nothing of the legal relation itself." With this, "the very foremost of those who had censured the Society's course, would be entirely satisfied!"

Is this statement correct? If so, the cause of humanity and religion has lost nothing by the refusal of the Secretaries to carry out the last year's vote of the Society; and would gain nothing by its making a change now, that should secure such compliance in future. Of the horrible sin of claiming the purchase of Christ's blood as "goods and chattels, personal," the Tract Society, it is said, has not been asked nor expected, by any of its members, to publish any thing! Is this so? The action of the Society, at its May anniversary, it may be hoped, will answer that question, one way or the other. It is no time for trifling, when the judg-

ments of Heaven seem ready to burst upon us as a nation, for this "rank impiety against God and His Anointed."

## Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1858.

### MAY ANNIVERSARY.

The AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY will hold its May Anniversary Meeting at Dr. CHEEVER'S CHURCH, Union Square, New York, on Thursday, May 13, at half-past 2 o'clock, P. M.

Among the speakers engaged are Rev. GEO. B. CHEEVER, D. D., and Rev. HENRY H. GARNETT.—A Collection will be taken up, in aid of the Treasury of the Society.

WILLIAM GOODELL,

WM. E. WHITING,

JAS. McCUNE SMITH,

Committee of Arrangements.

Editors please copy.

### CONGRESS AND THE LECOMPTON BILL.

THE LECOMPTON-KANSAS SUBJUGATION BILL passed the Senate of the United States, March 23. This must be regarded as a ratification, so far as the Senate is concerned, of the GREAT CONSPIRACY to force slavery upon all the States of the Union, under authority of the Federal Government. The Judiciary, and the Executive had ratified it previously. The aristocratic branch of the Legislature has now done the same, and the long lingering catastrophe awaits the final action of the House of Representatives. We say "the final" action, for although it has acted twice, it may be called upon to act again.

In the Senate, eight Democrats from free States, voted for the Kansas-Lecompton bill, viz.: Allen, R. I.; Bigler, Penn.; Bright, Fitch, Ind.; Gwin, Cal.; Jones, Iowa; Thomson, Wright, N. J.

The following Democrats from free States voted against it, viz.: Broderick, Cal.; Douglas, Ill.; Pugh, Ohio; Stuart, Mich.

So that two-thirds of the Northern Democratic Senators voted for the enslavement of the free States, while only one-third of them voted against it. And Pugh, of Ohio, who voted against it, in obedience to instructions, exerted his influence in its favor. All the Southern Democratic Senators voted for the Bill.

Two South Americans, Bell of Tennessee, and Crittenden of Kentucky, voted against the bill, while two others of the same party, Kennedy of Maryland, and Houston of Texas, voted in its favor,—Houston voted in obedience to instructions, but spoke on the other side.

All the Republican Senators, of course, voted against it.

The vote stood—Yeas 33: Nays 25.

Before the passage of the bill, Mr. CRITTENDEN (Ky.) moved a substitute for the bill, in substance, that the Constitution be submitted to the people now, and if approved of, the President to admit Kansas by proclamation. If rejected, the people to call a Convention and frame a Constitution. The substitute makes special provision against fraud.

This was voted down by a vote of 34 to 24, Mr. Kennedy, of Maryland, voting in its favor,

reserving the right to vote for the original Bill, on the defeat of the substitute.

The DESIGN, therefore, to FORCE slavery upon "the STATE" of Kansas, was open, unequivocal, and undisguised. The principle and the precedent would justify, if not require, a similar act in respect to all the States. But there is another view of the case. Allowing freedom to have equal rights with slavery under the Constitution, (which, by the bye, the Democratic Senate, the Executive, and the Judiciary, very clearly do not allow,) the precedent would sufficiently authorize the Federal enforcement of an anti-slavery (a Republican) form of Government upon "every State in this Union," as the Constitution requires. Some consolation in this.

### ACTION IN THE HOUSE.

April 1. The Senate Kansas-Lecompton bill was taken up for action. J. R. GIDDINGS of Ohio, objected to the second reading. This raised the question, "Shall the Bill be rejected?" Yeas 95: Nays 137.

The yeas included all the Republican Members of the House, 92 in number, together with three Democrats—Harris of Illinois, (who was brought in from his sick room, and laid down upon his seat,) and Hickman and Chapman of Pennsylvania.

The next vote was on Mr. Quitman's amendment to Mr. Montgomery's amendment, viz., substitute the original Senate bill, striking out Mr. Pugh's amendment. This was rejected by a vote of 160 to 72. Then the question was taken on Mr. Montgomery's amendment ("which is but slightly different from Mr. Crittenden's in the Senate,") and this was adopted by a vote of 120 Yeas to 112 Nays.

The Yeas included the 92 Republicans, 2 Democrats, and 6 Americans. The Democrats were—McKibben, of Cal.; Morris, Harris, Shaw, R. Smith, S. S. Marshall, of Ill.; English, Foley, J. G. Davis, Ind.; Adrian, N. J. Haskin, H. F. Clark, N. Y.; Pendleton, Grobeck, Cockerell, Hall, Cox, Lawrence, Ohio. O. Jones, Hickman, Montgomery, Penn.—The Americans were, Underwood, H. Marshall, Ky.; Ricaud, J. M. Harris, J. Winter Davis, Md.; Gilmer, N. C.

Of the Nays, 104 were Democrats, and 20 were Americans. Of members from Free States, who voted against the substitute, were Democrats, viz.: Scott, Cal.; Arnold, Bishop, Conn.; Niblack, Hughes, Gregg, Ind. Huyter, Wortendike, N. J.; Searing, Taylor, Sickles, Kelly, Maclay, John Cochrane, Wash. Russell, Corning, Hatch, N. Y.; Miller, Bur Ohio; Florence, Landy, Phillips, Glancy Jones, Leidy, Dimmick, White, Ahl, Gillis, Reid, Dewart, Penn.—30 in all. These, with the confederates in the Senate, may be put down as incorrigible slaveocrats, ready to go lengths with the oligarchy, even to the enslavement of the Free States, by the Federal power. Southern Democrats, not a single member voted otherwise than with these.

Up to this point, the record of the Republicans in Congress, as tried by their own record and platform, stands fair and unimpeached. It passes to the next stage of action.

The amendment having been made, the question recurred upon the passage of the bill as amended. What was the true policy of



Republicans in respect to this vote? They had got the bill amended, so that if it were passed at all, it would pass with all the modifications which that amendment had secured. But why should *they* wish to have it pass at all? What obligations were *they* under, to help the bill through the House, in any shape? What benefit to Kansas, to the country, or to the cause of freedom, could come of its passage? Why not leave it for their opponents to manage the bill, in *that shape*, as they best could? We quote from the Tribune's record—

The final vote on the passage of the bill as amended, is: Yeas, One Hundred and Twenty; Nays, One Hundred and Twelve. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Hurra!

The vote on the passage of the bill as amended is the same as on adopting the Crittenden amendment.

So the Lecompton bill, as amended, passed the House by the vote of the Republicans, and their allies, against the vote of the Democrats. The adoption of the amendment might be regarded as a triumph over the oligarchy.—But why is the "Hurrah" reserved for the passage of the Bill? What was the ground for triumph here?

#### ACTION AGAIN IN THE SENATE.

The Lecompton Bill, as amended in the House, was, of course, sent back to the Senate. Mr. Green submitted a motion to disagree with House's amendment, which, after some discussion, was adopted, by Yeas 32; Nays 23—being nearly the same vote as before. And so the Senate's determination to force slavery upon a sovereign State, stands re-affirmed.

A remarkable feature of the vote of the Lecomptonites in the House, adverse to the action of their own party in the Senate, is thus noticed in the N. Y. Tribune:—

"A majority of the Lecomptonites voted to strike out the amendment of Mr. Pugh, which gave the people of Kansas the power to change their Constitution whenever they choose, showing that they did not believe that the Lecompton Constitution can be changed until after 1864!"

Almost equally remarkable was the neglect of the Anti-Lecompton men in the House, to retain in their bill, that same amendment of Mr. Pugh, (embraced in the Senate bill,) allowing to the people of Kansas the right of changing their Constitution whenever they pleased. Whatever they might have thought of its necessity, or of its efficacy, it could have done no harm, and would have been a distinct recognition of an important right, which has been questioned. While their opponents voted to strike it out, they did not take care to retain it.

#### FURTHER ACTION IN THE HOUSE.

The House (April 8) by a vote of 119 to 111 adheres to its disagreement with the Senate, on the Kansas Lecompton bill. In other words, it adheres to its own bill, with the amendment submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the people of Kansas, and refuses to accept the Senate bill, which makes no such provision.

What will be done next, remains to be seen. Unless the Senate recedes from its position, unless it adopts the bill passed by the House, or proposes and obtains some compromise, the Lecompton bill fails entirely—the very best result that could be expected, until some new Constitution is made, and submitted to Congress.

A correspondent of the N. Y. Tribune (April 9) says that there will be "an attempt at accommodation." The correspondent of the N. Y.

Times, same date, says, "The Senate will now propose a Committee of Conference, and the Administration men say still they will carry it in the House."

#### THE "GREAT TRIUMPH."

"A great triumph was achieved yesterday in the House," says the N. Y. Tribune of April 2.

Of the nature and extent of the victory, the Tribune furnishes us, in the same article, a significant outline, defined chiefly by negatives, showing what did *not* triumph.

1. "It was not a triumph of any party, though every Republican chosen to the House supported it, and but a fraction of any other party. But the Republicans by themselves were powerless," &c.

2. "Nor is it a victory over the Democratic party."—"The motion to amend was by a Democrat." Without the presence and aid of Democrats, "the Senate bill must have passed by 14 majority."

3. "Nor is it a triumph of the free over the slave States." The amendment was from "Mr. Crittenden, a slaveholder." "But for six votes in its favor, from the slave States, it must have been rejected."

4. "Nor is it in purpose, a triumph over the Administration." Many friends of the Administration voted for it, to save the Administration from disgrace and ruin.

Thus far the negatives of the Tribune, to which a number of items might be added, as—

5. It was not a triumph of either the Free Soil, or the Free Democracy, or the Republican platforms, from 1848 to 1856. It was not a triumph of the principle of "non-extension," nor of the motto of "No more slave States," nor of Federal exclusion of slavery from the Territories. Quite the reverse of all this.

6. It was not a triumph of the Anti-Lecompton men, in the position taken by them in their speeches in the Senate and House of Representatives, so far as their condemnations of the wicked, despotic, and anti-republican features of the Lecompton Constitution are concerned. It is not a triumph of the strong arguments they have urged against giving the assent of Congress to such an outrageous insult to the principles of the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, as is contained in the Lecompton Constitution, wherein it is affirmed that—

"The right of property is before and higher than any Constitutional sanction, and the right of any owner of a SLAVE to such slave, and its increase, is the same, and as inviolable as the right of ANY owner of ANY property whatsoever."

The vote of the House, if it takes effect, conveys the consent of Congress, and of the Republican members, to the admission of Kansas with such a Constitution, (a Constitution denying the right of any State to exclude or abolish slavery, even by a change of the Constitution,) provided a bare majority of the "white" voters of Kansas, shall assent to it. Consequently

7. It is not a triumph of anti-slavery sentiment in Congress. Quite the reverse of this.

And here again, we may cite the testimony of the Tribune, which says that "the proposition that the Lecompton bill be utterly rejected" was defeated "by a majority of forty two." "The unqualified and uncompromising opponents of slavery are, perhaps, even fewer than the Republicans." This is very evident.

Wherein, then, did the "great triumph" consist? Here, again, we will let the Tribune tell the story:

"It is a triumph over frauds in elections." "It is a triumph of genuine popular sovereignty, the right of the people to frame their own institutions, and choose their own rulers." "It is a triumph of Legislative Independence over the most unconstitutional and dangerous abuse of Executive power and patronage.—It is a victory of Good Faith over Executive Treachery."

We have abbreviated the Tribune's statement, but the above is the substance. On one point we must demur. We cannot call that "a triumph of genuine, popular sovereignty" which recognizes the right of a majority of the people to determine whether or no a minority of the people shall be slaves; nor that which, in submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the decision of the "white" male inhabitants, ignores the colored people, as though they had "no rights which a white man is bound to respect."

#### HOW THE SLAVEHOLDERS UNDERSTAND IT.

Says the New York Tribune:

"The journals in the interest of Buchanan and Lecompton are exultingly proclaiming that the anti-Lecompton members of Congress have conceded the main ground of dispute between them and their opponents in adopting the Crittenden Montgomery substitute, and thereupon agreeing to the bill. The Herald and its confederates ring the changes on this assertion from day to day."

#### THE TRIBUNE'S ANSWER:

"Well gentlemen! we call you to witness that the anti-Lecompton side of Congress has conceded all that can reasonably be required of them, yourselves being judges."

"We take your Lecompton Constitution, eternal slavery and all, provided the people of Kansas do not see fit to reject it and form a new one instead."

"The House cannot recede—if it has already given up nearly all that is in dispute, who can ask it, to go further? If those who are opposed to any more Slave States can take the Crittenden substitute, who can press them to do more? You say, gentlemen from the South! that you don't expect to make Kansas a slave State, you are only struggling for the abstract principle that a new slave State may come into the Union, provided there shall be one waiting to come in. Have you not your abstraction in the Crittenden bill? Then why not accept it, and let Kansas cease to be a source of national agitation? Why not settle the question now?"

Here, it will be perceived, is no denial of the statements of the Lecompton journals, but an explicit reiteration of them. If this be not a direct and explicit abandonment, not only of the old Free Soil doctrine, but of the Republican platform of 1856, we confess ourselves unable to understand the meaning of the language. Equally unable are we to put any other construction upon the action of the House of Representatives.

The Tribune here agrees with the N. Y. Times, as quoted in our last number, in its reply to the Richmond Whig, namely, that the North will make no more opposition to the admission of new Slave States, provided a majority of said State really desires it. And how can the Republicans in the House consistently object against the admission of any other State, desiring to be a Slave State after having assented to it in the case of Kansas.

If it be said that the House consented to this, on condition of the consent of Kansas, which, they were well assured would not be given, we fail to see how, as a matter of principle, this mends the matter. It is saying to the people of Kansas, "We will consent to it, if you will." But what right has the House to express its consent to a wicked Constitution, in case the people of Kansas consent to it?

The previous vote of ninety-five members to reject the Senate bill altogether, does not do away this subsequent vote, which, coming after the previous one, annuls and retracts it.

#### THE AGREEMENT AND THE DIFFERENCE.

The Senate Bill and the House bill for the admission of Kansas—

AGREE, (1.) That Kansas shall be admitted into the Union. (2.) That, in this admission, the Topeka Constitution, excluding slavery—a Constitution framed and presented by the people of Kansas, and once approved by the House, as a basis of her admission, shall be ignored and set aside. (3.) That Kansas shall be admitted into the Union, under the Lecompton Constitution, which was the work of the Border Ruffians, framed and adopted by them through violence, craft and fraud—a Constitution which establishes slavery—which affirms the right of slaveholders to slave property, to be "before and higher than any constitutional sanction," and thus denies the right of any State to exclude slavery, by Constitution or otherwise.

Thus far the Senate bill and the House bill agree. Republicans, Douglas Democrats, and Buchanan Democrats, all agree thus far.

The difference between them is this:

The Senate bill provides for the admission of Kansas, under this Constitution, immediately and unconditionally, without submitting it to the people for their ratification or rejection: but declaring that they have the right to amend, to abolish it, or form another in its stead, as soon as they please.

The House bill provides for the previous submission of this Constitution, for the acceptance or rejection of the "white" people of Kansas; with power to form a new Constitution and to be admitted under it, in case the Lecompton Constitution should have been rejected by them. But in case the Lecompton Constitution should be adopted, it contains no declaration, as in the Senate bill, of the right to amend it previous to 1864. It also "rejects" the ordinance attached to the Lecompton Constitution, and to which the Senate bill, also, refused to give its "assent."

The substance of the matter, then, more briefly stated in other words, is this:

\* The italics are in the Tribune.



The Senate bill admits Kansas, under the Lecompton Constitution, as a slave State; but admits the right of the people to make for themselves a Free State Constitution, as soon as they please. The House bill admits Kansas under the same Constitution, as a slave State, provided a bare majority of the "white" citizens of Kansas shall adopt it; but, in that case, it says nothing of the right of the people, against the provisions of that Constitution, to adopt another, abolishing slavery, previous to 1864.

Which of the two rival bills would soonest secure freedom in Kansas, time, and unforeseen circumstances, might determine, though the House bill appears now the most favorable.

In principle the difference is this. The Senate bill establishes slavery in Kansas, by Federal authority, against the will of a majority of the people of Kansas. The House bill gives the Federal assent to the establishment of slavery in Kansas, provided a bare majority of its "white" citizens desire it.

#### "THE LECOMPTON SWINDLE" THAT SWINDLED ITS OPPOSERS.

It was a just remark of Mr. Blair, of Missouri, in his speech in Congress, that "*the Lecompton Constitution is a Constitution for the whole country.*" Equally true is it that the Lecompton swindle, is a swindle for the whole country, and, emphatically, a swindle for its opponents in Congress.

The ostensible object of the movement was to force slavery upon Kansas. The Richmond Whig, however affirms that this was *not* the real object; that they knew they could not make and keep Kansas a slave State; and that they only insisted upon its admission under the Lecompton Constitution, in order to settle the principle that a slave State can be admitted.

According to this statement, the Lecompton bill was driven through the Senate simply to effect that object. And when the Anti Lecomptonites, including the 92 Republicans in the House, consented to the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, with the Crittenden amendment, the object avowed by the Richmond Whig was accomplished.

And, yet, there, was, evidently, a still deeper swindle attempted to be accomplished, to wit, the establishment of the principle that the Constitution and natural law carry slavery into the States, and protect it there. Whether this will be, likewise, at present, accomplished remains to be seen, though it must be confessed that the conditional endorsement by the House, of the Lecompton Constitution, (which distinctly affirms that principle,) comes frightfully near to a national endorsement of it. The nation's only reliance against it now, is the Kansas vote, subject to Border Ruffian violence and fraud, aided, perhaps, by Federal arms as well as Federal supervision. The House gives up all, in the hope that Kansas, herself, will reverse the Congressional action!

#### HOW THE LECOMPTON BILL MIGHT HAVE BEEN STRANGLED.

In our March number we said, that if six or eight Senators, and twenty or thirty Representatives, would but take the initiative of a movement in Congress for a Federal abolition of slavery in the States, thus joining open and direct issue with the opposite principle and object of the Lecompton bill, they might have exchanged positions with their opponents, and thrown them on the defensive. The project of forcing the Lecompton Constitution upon Kansas, and upon the country, would have been abandoned, of course. That article we sent marked, as we now send this, to every Republican Senator and Representative in Congress, and wrote letters on the subject to more than one-half of them. No one, we think, can doubt that our proposed remedy would have been an effectual one, had it been promptly and earnestly applied. Possibly it may not be too late yet, though we fear it is. Our defenders in Congress have preferred to continue the defensive retreating policy which has been in vogue with them for nearly ten years past, and with uniform results. With exception of one or two seeming and temporary victories, we have had a series of disgraceful defeats, till the friends of freedom are well nigh disheartened. Shall we never learn a higher wisdom? Shall we continue to grope on in darkness, forgetful of that one great primary

lesson of universal History, that foundation principle of all political science, that no nation, under the overruling Providence of God, can ever preserve its own liberties or escape final extinction, at any lower price than that of demanding and securing the liberties of *all their inhabitants?*

We wish it to be distinctly understood, that we do not question the personal or political integrity of our Senators and Representatives, whose course we have freely criticised, as tested by their own ethical standards, which are the current ones, and in which they have been educated. But we do deplore deeply the prevalence of maxims, usages, and precedents which, if followed, must forever defeat all endeavors for the preservation of our liberties.

#### THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

If any one had predicted, a few weeks ago, that the opponents of the Lecompton bill would have voted for it, with such an amendment as Mr. Crittenden's, it would not have been believed. If, during the last Presidential election, it had been predicted that, in 1858, the leaders of the Republican party in Congress, naming them, would have voted to admit Kansas as a slave State, with a Constitution declaring the right to slave property "inviolable, above and higher than any Constitutional sanction," on condition of its adoption by a majority of the people of Kansas, the prediction would have been repelled as a slander. If, in the days of the Free Soil or the Free Democratic parties, its leaders, in Congress now, had been told that, on any emergency, they would ever vote to admit a new slave State, they would have exclaimed—"Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?"

Thus much for the past. Now for the future. Should any one now predict that the leading Republicans in Congress will ever vote to repeal the laws forbidding the African slave trade, it would be thought uncharitable, slanderous and abusive. We will make no such prediction. We would hope better things. But let us imagine a case, by no means an improbable one.

Suppose a bill for repealing the prohibition were introduced. Suppose it to affirm the right of importers of slaves to sell them in any and every port in the Union, and the right of any one to purchase and hold them there, in defiance of State laws. Suppose such a bill to pass the Senate—a fair parallel to the Senate Lecompton Bill. Then suppose an amendment should be offered, when it should come before the House, that said clause of the bill, as above described, should go into effect only in such States as should consent to it,—a fair parallel to the Crittenden amendment.

The question is, in such a case, what would the Republicans in the House do with such an amendment, and with the bill as thus amended? Would they, after having helped to adopt the amendment, vote to pass the bill?

If they should, they would thereby vote to open the slave trade in all the States that should desire it! And would they not thus be following out the policy and the precedent of their recent vote on the Lecompton bill? If not, let the difference be pointed out, if it can be. State Sovereignty and State Rights would furnish as good pleas in the one case as in the other. So, also, in respect to the "rights of property," whether under sanction of municipal, natural, or Constitutional law. Why should not those who voted for the House Lecompton bill vote for such an amended African slave trade bill? And why should not the latter be heralded as a "glorious triumph," as well as the former?

The truth is, those who, in opposing the aggressions of the slave power, strike only at the branches, and not at the root, who act only on the defensive, and merely strike to ward off one blow at a time, who are guided by fluctuating circumstances instead of abiding principles, who resort to temporary expedients instead of discharging permanent responsibilities, can never tell, beforehand, what they will do, or what they will not do. Their policy places them completely in the

hands of their enemies. Whenever the slave power desires their assent to a given principle or measure, it has only to tack on to it something still more outrageous, to be lopped off by amendment, and the desired assent is obtained. And this is the secret of the strange fact, that the more outrageous the demands of the slave power, the more rapidly and surely do they make progress. They understand their game, and calculate upon the certain result.

#### "OFF AND ON."

The N. Y. Tribune defends "the Republican vote in Congress for the Crittenden Montgomery substitute," and says that it is no "abandonment of principle," and is extensively alleged. The Tribune does not deny that that vote "allows Kansas to come in as a slave State if she shall prefer to do so." But it answers—

"1. We know that Kansas does not and will not prefer to come in as a slave State; 2. If she did, the Republicans would violate none of their cherished principles in allowing it. Turn to the Philadelphia platform (see Tribune Almanac for '58, p. 33,) scan carefully, and there you will find no declaration, no protest, against the admission of a *bona fide* slave State as such. The Republicans are too sensible, too practical, to undertake locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen."—N. Y. Tribune, April 9.

We did "scan it carefully" when it first appeared, and stated its omissions precisely as the Tribune now states them. But, for having done this, we encountered innumerable charges of having misrepresented the platform. Republican editors and orators all over the country, kept up the old Free Soil cry, "No more slave States," and solicited votes on that ground of it. Two thirds of all the Anti-slavery and Free Soil wing of the Fremont party\* voted for him because they believed him to be on that platform, and his letter was quoted in proof of it. The Tribune disclaimer, some time since, in accordance with the above, was an astonishment to many. Quotations from it, in our January number, were read, by some, with apparent incredulity. But the Tribune again repeats: We hope that Anti-slavery voters will, at length, learn to "scan carefully," and in due season, the platform gotten up for them by the politicians who seek the votes, noticing what they do *not* say, as well as what they say. It strikes us that the cognomen of "*off and on*," which the Tribune applies to "some of the Republican Journals" that find fault with the late Republican vote in the House, might be better applied in another direction. And we must needs add that by the Tribune's own showing, the "stable door" was not "locked" before "the horse was stolen." We "the Republicans too sensible, too practical," to do that? Or was their platform too low and narrow to enable them to do it? Whether "the cherished principles" of the Republicans are violated by voting for the admission of new slave States, we leave them to judge for themselves. Ours certainly are. And severely as we were supposed to have "scanned" the Republican platform, we did read it as being "in favor of admitting Kansas as a Free State," and we think we should have justly incurred the charge of misrepresenting it, had we intimated that, consistently with a Republican could have voted to admit Kansas, any contingency, as a Slave State.

\* We make no account here, of the pro-slavery Herndon wing, by whom he was first nominated, and forced upon the Republican leaders, so much to the annoyance of some of them. Nor do we include the forces mastered by the "*off and on*" New York Times, whose editor was the master architect of the Pittsburg platform.

#### SLAVERY EXAMINED BY THE LIGHT OF NATURE. A SERMON PREACHED BY REV. GEO. W. BASSETT AT THE CONG. CH. WASHINGTON, D. C.

The preaching and publishing of such a sermon, in such a place, and at such a time, is a marked indication of progress, in the exercise of free speech and a free press. Since 1838, when, in the same city, Dr. Reuben Crandall was arrested, imprisoned, tried for his life, and by the effect on his health, sent to a premature



grave, for no alleged crime, but that of having in his trunk some old anti-slavery papers, and of lending an anti-slavery pamphlet to a citizen.

And we are gratified to notice that this truly bold and masterly expose of the wickedness of slavery, the duty and necessity of its immediate abolition, and the folly and criminality of all compromises with it, is published at the request of eight distinguished Senators and Representatives in Congress, viz.: Wm. H. Seward, Chas. Dukee, Philemon Bliss, John A. Bingham, H. Hamlin, H. Wilson, J. R. Giddings, and Owen Lovejoy.

We deeply regret that the limited space of our monthly sheet prevents us from giving it to our readers entire. We had marked several paragraphs for extract, but even for this we have no adequate room, now. Some idea of its sentiments may be conveyed by gleanings out a few isolated expressions.

"The great controversy in the nation is in regard to the moral character of negro slavery. The liberties of the whites are indeed involved because the negro can be enslaved only by restricting the liberties of the whites."

"God Almighty is for the negro. He is troubling our nation for her immeasurable crimes against this class of her population."—"It is all vain trifling, therefore, to contend against these natural and retributive effects of slavery, while you leave the mighty cause in full operation."

"The liberties of the blacks must be restored, or those of the whites must be destroyed. Twenty-four millions of republicans who hold four millions of slaves, are too selfish to maintain their own liberties." "They deserve ignoble subjection to a one man power. Slavery by a masterly generalship, has thrown its antagonist on the defensive, and now wages an aggressive war upon liberty. The question now seems to be, not shall Slavery die, but shall Liberty live? I look upon this state of things as the retributive natural effect of ignoring the subject, &c."—"If the pulpit could innocently be silent on this evil, it could with as much honesty and more consistency justify it. If legislatures could prevent it, why not extend it? All compromises with slavery are sinful and delusive. Men speak of the rights of slavery. It has no rights, nor can we properly tolerate slavery. May we tolerate murder?"—"The idea of giving peace to the country, while a slave groans on our soil, contemplates the utter extinction of true virtue."

"OLD HESY"—by MRS. C. W. DENISON. We have now read it, and find it to be one of the most startling and exciting books of its class—one of the best written, and one of the most thoroughly abolition in its sentiments. It touches the beast in a new spot, and a tender one. It discloses slavery in the parlor—slavery in its demoralizing influences upon the wives and daughters of slaveholders. If the chivalry cried out at the revelations of Uncle Tom, what will they say to those of Old Hesy?

We gratefully acknowledge the receipt of interesting public documents from Hon. Wm. H. Seward, Wm. P. Fessenden, Preston King, Charles Sumner, I. Washburne, Jr., E. P. Walton, J. R. Giddings, A. P. Granger, L. D. Campbell, F. E. Spinner, Frank P. Blair, Owen Lovejoy, S. G. Andrews, Philemon Bliss, and Dewitt C. Leach.

#### POWER OF EARNESTNESS.

"The English Puritans, who overturned the throne, uncassocked the Bishops, and stripped the altar of all its ornaments, were very far from being a majority of the English people. The Independents, who cut off the King's head, abolished the House of Lords, and made Cromwell Lord Protector, so far from being a majority of the people of England, were in fact but a small minority even of the Puritan body. The French Republicans, who ruled France for a time with such absolute ascendancy, and that upon theories totally new, and to the absolute overturn, for the time being, of all pre-existing arrangements, were never but a very limited number, compared with the whole body of the French people."—*N. Y. Tribune, Jan. 7.*

The Tribune proceeds to notice how the little knot of slaveholders in this country control the entire nation. And it cites these and simi-

lar instances, to show that minorities, and not majorities, not unfrequently govern.

The Tribune is right. And this great fact (which we have so often insisted upon,) we here record again—and, for this time, we do it in the Tribune's own language, as our standing answer, at all times, to the stereotyped taunt against earnest abolitionists, by the Tribune and its associates, that unless they will consent to drift down-stream with *majorities*, on the current of compromise, they will only be 'throwing away their votes!' Universal history, including that of our own country, stamps all such upbraidings with folly, and the extracts above quoted are but specimens. Minorities overthrew the system of a State paid clergy in New England, and minorities established the Sub-Treasury instead of the National Bank. Minorities, by resolute determination, and in no other way, become, sometimes, majorities. But, when they do, they frequently achieve their great victories first, and, in consequence, become majorities afterwards.

Sixty thousand earnest abolitionists, by voting for Birney, in 1844, inaugurated all the organized political opposition to the aggressions of the slave power that has since been witnessed. The death of the Whig party, and the present contortions and gaspings of the Democratic party, are among the results of that earnestness in 1844. Had those sixty thousand all voted 'for Clay, to keep out Texas,' as the Tribune advised, (or, rather had one half of them done this, and the other half voted for Polk, as would have been the consequence of their sticking to their old parties,) there would have been an end to political agitation on the subject.

Had those sixty thousand retained their original position of hostility to slavery itself, instead of exchanging it for mere hostility to slavery extension, we should, doubtless, have been nearer, now, national abolition of slavery, than we are to a national prohibition of its extension.

It is earnestness that controls nations—indomitable, inflexible, uncompromising earnestness—like that of the English Puritans, the Independents, the French Republicans, the Abolitionists of 1844. Give us but the return of that earnestness, that determination, that resolution, that inflexibility of purpose, along with the vigilance, the self-denial, the self-sacrifice, the untiring effort, and the unity of action, which such earnestness secures and includes, and so far as human instrumentalities are concerned, we ask nothing more.

There are less than two hundred thousand slaveholders in this country, and they control it, simply because they are thoroughly in earnest, and consequently will submit to no compromises. Give us but an equal number of equally earnest and uncompromising abolitionists, and we are ready for the contest. The balance of power would be on our side, because truth, justice, humanity, reason, conscience, God, and his overruling Providence are on our side,—all pledged to the support of honest earnestness for Truth and Right.

'According to your faith be it unto you.'—'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even your faith.' Faith, and earnestness for the right, are two phases of the self-same thing. Both are inspirations from God, and are partakers of the same Divine Omnipotence.

#### DISTRESSING CALAMITY—DEATH OF PROF. HUDSON.

We have to record the sudden and mysterious death of PROF. TIMOTHY B. HUDSON, of Oberlin, who was found killed on the railroad track, near Cleveland, two trains having passed over him. Whether he was trying to get on or off the first train, when in motion, after a short stop, is not certainly known, as the fact was unnoticed at the time; but, somehow, he fell under, and was crushed. The engineer of another train, about ten minutes afterwards, saw him lying, but too late to prevent running over him. He was so marred as to be identified only by his clothing and carpet-bag. Prof. Hudson was extensively known, beloved, and respected, as a man, a gentleman, a Christian, a scholar, a reformer, an abolitionist of the most thorough stamp. He was aged about forty-four, and for twenty years had been Professor at Oberlin. To his family, to the college, to the cause of Christian reform, the loss seems irreparable, but to him, we have no doubt, the exchange is a happy one. "What thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."

#### POSITION OF THE N. Y. TRIBUNE.

"Candid reader! All we ask is that slavery and anti-slavery, this party and that party, shall be forgotten, and the admission of Kansas effected in accordance with the wishes of her people, and not otherwise. We want this question settled exactly as though no negro had ever existed. How else should it be?"—*N. Y. Tribune, March 12.*

Undoubtedly the Lecompton swindle would be defeated or abandoned, if a majority of the members of Congress would take and maintain the position recommended by the *Tribune*. But will they? Is it possible for the American people to be neutral or indifferent in respect to slavery and anti-slavery, and in respect to the rights of the negro? Assuredly they cannot. And they have no right to be. The Providence of God will not permit them to be. On one side or the other, every man is, and has been, and will ever be. The proposal of the *Tribune*, therefore, is an impracticable one.

But suppose it were otherwise? Suppose it possible that Kansas could be temporarily saved from slavery in this way. What follows? A principle, a precedent is established. It is this, that slavery and anti-slavery are no longer to be made a test in the admission of new States. If the free States should adhere to that principle and precedent, the slave States would not. But suppose they would. Would it be right? Or would the nation be saved by it? Wherein would it differ from the guilty course of the nation in years past? the very course that has brought us into our present condition? The old race of unrighteous and truckling compromise, over again?

"How else should it be?" What a question for the New York *Tribune* to ask! "How else should it be" but to ignore wholly the rights of the negro, just as Judge Taney has done? "How else should it be" but to concede to majorities the right to enslave minorities, whenever they choose to do so?

Is it strange that, under the guidance of leaders like these, the friends of freedom are constantly foiled, and the slave power has every thing its own way? 'How else could it be?'

If this be the "philosophy of reform," what would be the philosophy of corruption?

#### ITEMS AND SUGGESTIONS.

The New Orleans *Bee* says:—

"The bill authorizing the importation into Louisiana of twenty-five hundred Africans, after passing the House with little or no opposition, has been rejected in the Senate, at the close of a most violent and exciting debate, by a majority of two."

This confirms, what had been discredited, the previous statement of the New Orleans *Delta*, that the people of that State were determined



